

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1-4, 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Murase et al. (US Patent No. 6,470,392).

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly point out that the multiple audio sources are from multiple, different audio sources. While Murase may show multiple audio streams, they are all from the same source, the File 1 on server 31. See Murase, column 3, lines 31-37 and lines 11-17. Further, The changing that is done in Murase is not between audio *sources* but between audio *streams*, as Murase is based upon providing multiple views of the same audiovisual presentation.

It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 2-4 and 6 depend from claim 1 and should be ruled allowable for that reason and for their own merits. Murase does not teach selecting one of multiple audio streams, where those audio streams come from multiple, different audio sources as in claim 2. Murase does not teach routing each of the audio streams to a stream receiver that maintains connection with the audio sources from which the streams came as in claim 3, as there is only one audio source in Murase. Murase does not teach delivering a selected stream to a user, where the selected stream is selected from among multiple streams from multiple, different sources as in claim 4. Murase likewise does not teach selecting one of the multiple audio streams, which is selecting a stream from one of multiple audio sources, using a predefined or present user input as in claim 6. The user input in Murase is to select different portions of the same audio presentation, which has been divided up into multiple streams.

It is therefore submitted that claims 2-4 and 6 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of all claims is requested.

With regard to claim 15, Murase does not teach reception of multiple audio streams from multiple, different audio sources, as discussed with regard to claim 1. It is therefore submitted that claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 5, 7-14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murase et al. in view of Goldszmidt et al (US Patent No. 6,195,680).

As discussed above, Murase teaches buffering of multiple audio streams from the same source. Goldszmidt teaches buffering multiple streams from multiple sources in multiple devices. The combination of references does not teach buffering multiple streams from multiple, different sources within one device as required by claims 1, from which claim 5 depends, or claim 7.

With regard to claim 5, the combination of references does not teach buffering multiple audio streams from multiple, different audio sources within one device, where that device is one of either a computer having software or an Internet radio receiver. It is therefore submitted that claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

With regard to claim 7, claim 7 requires that an Internet radio receiver have a stream manager to receive and buffer audio streams from multiple Internet radio sources within one device. This is not shown, taught nor suggested by the combination of references. It is therefore submitted that claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 8-14 depend from claim 7 and should be ruled allowable for that reason and for their own merits. As discussed above, the combination of references does not show, teach, nor suggest multiple Internet radio source being the source of multiple audio streams being buffered within one device, as in claim 8. The combination of references also does not

teach that the connector is a wireless receiver, a power line or a network cable, as in claim 9, or that the wireless receiver of claim 9 comprises an interface as in claim 10. Further, the combination of references does not teach that the interface of claim 10 is one of the group set forth in claim 11.

With regard to claims 12 and 13, the combination of references does not teach a speaker or a display on a device that has a stream manager to receive multiple audio streams from multiple Internet radio sources.

With regard to claim 14, the combination of references does not teach multiple audio streams being received from multiple audio sources within one device, much less that the one device further has multiple stream receivers, multiple stream buffers and a stream selector.

It is therefore submitted that claims 7-14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

With regard to claims 16 and 17, these claims depend from claim 15 and should be ruled allowable for that reason and for their own merits. The addition of Goldszmidt in combination with Murase does not overcome the deficiency with regard to Murase as discussed with regard to claim 15. The combination of references does not teach that the instructions are executed by a single device, either a computer, as in claim 16 or an Internet radio receiver as in claim 17. It is therefore submitted that claims 16 and 17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The prior art made of record but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613
Customer No. 20575